

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/501,677	03/25/2005		Felix Ecker	Le A 35 839	2331	
35969 Royer Health	7590 Coro I I C	02/05/2008		EXAMINER		
Bayer Health Care LLC 400 Morgan Lane				GRAHAM, SHELLEY R		
West Haven, CT 06516				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				4173		
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
				02/05/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/501,677	ECKER ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	SHELLEY R. GRAHAM	4173					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin 11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status		•					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-19 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Second is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
•							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate					

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.
- This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.
- In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.
- Group I, claim(s) 1-11 and 15-19, drawn to a composition comprising a salt of O-acetylsalicylic acid with a basic amino acid.
- 5. Group II, claim(s) 12-14, drawn to a method of administering said composition.
- The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:
- The common technical feature among the above listed groups is O-acetylsalicylic acid. Kagitani et al. (U.S. Patent 4,265,888, issue date: 05 May 1981, column 2, lines 12-17) teaches explicitly compositions comprising of O-acetylsalicylic acid with a basic amino acid. Since Applicant's inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when viewed over the prior art, they do not have a single general inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/501,677 Page 3

Art Unit: 4173

Species Election in Group I and II

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed-to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

- 9. Species election for the basic amine:
- (a) Claim 5 is generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species' lysine, arginine, histidine, ornithine, and diaminobutyric acid.
- The species are independent or distinct because each product has an unrelated chemical structure and function. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.
- Further species election as follows is required for the type of disease treatment:
 - (b1) conditions/disorders listed in claim 12, the Applicant is required to specify one single condition/disorder or
 - (b2) conditions/disorders listed in claim 13, the Applicant is required to specify one single condition/disorder or
 - (b3) conditions/disorders listed in claim 14, the Applicant is required to specify one single condition/disorder.

- The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:
- They are different disease conditions of different causative factors and different pathology. The method and process of treating each disease is different. Therefore, each has its own special technical feature.
- Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.
- Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).
- The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: all claims are generic.
- The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 4173

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Inventorship Notice

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Notice of Possible Rejoinder

- The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.
- In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims

Application/Control Number: 10/501,677

Art Unit: 4173

will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the examiner before the patent issues withdraws the restriction requirement. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelley R. Graham, whose telephone number is 571-270-1563. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8am-3pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Application/Control Number: 10/501,677

Art Unit: 4173

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SRG

23 January 2008

